UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,411	05/05/2006	Andrew Thomas Busey	104128-213201/US	2401

64494 7590 01/23/2009

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP (SV)
IP DOCKETING
2450 COLORADO AVENUE
SUITE 400E
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404

EXAMINER	
TRAN, PHILIP B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/578,411	BUSEY, ANDREW THOMAS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip B. Tran	2455	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-18,20-32 and 34-42* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5, 19 and 33* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to Amendment filed 08 October 2008. Claims 1-42 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-42 are pending for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3, 17 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what "information handling system" is being referred to in claims 3, 17 and 31. Corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20-32 and 34-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata et al (Hereafter, Kawabata), U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2005/0044246 A1 in view of Bates et al (Hereafter, Bates), U.S. Pat. No. 6,184,886.

Regarding claim 1, Kawabata teaches a method performed by at least one information handling system, the method comprising:

creating folders on a server information handling system in response requests submitted from a users over a network (i.e., setting up a list of folders on the server to be accessed by user terminals via a network) [see Fig. 3]. Kawabata does not explicitly teach displaying search result and a list of folders on a web browser window and saving selected portion of the result of the search in a folder that is selected by the user among the displayed list of folders.

However, Bates teaches a list of folders to be displayed on a display device, within at least one web browser window connected to the server, the web browser having a result of a search by a website in response to a search term query specified by the user (i.e., displaying search result and a list of folders) [see Figs. 2 & 6]; and in response to a command from the user via the web browser window, saving a selected portion of the result of the search (URLs) on the server in a folder that is selected by the user from among the displayed list of folders (i.e., adding URLs to selected folders) [see Fig. 6 and Col. 8, Line 56 to Col. 9, Line 6]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bates into the teaching of Kawabata in order to efficiently save file or data in an appropriate folder for sharing over the network.

Regarding claim 2, Kawabata does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein the result of the search is: a result of a search of the website. However, Bates

further teaches a result of a search of the website [see Col. 1, Line 64 to Col. 2, Line 67 and Col. 7, Lines 10-34]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bates into the teaching of Kawabata for the same reason set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 3, Kawabata does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein the result of the search is: a result of a search of the website, wherein the information handling system outputs a web services call to the website, and wherein the website performs the search in response to the web services call and outputs the result of the search to the information handling system. However, Bates further teaches web services call to the website and performing search (i.e., client-server communication and querying) [see Col. 1, Line 45 to Col. 2, Line 13]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bates into the teaching of Kawabata for the same reason set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 4, Kawabata does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein the website is a first website, and wherein the result of the search is: a result of a search of at least a second website. However, Bates further teaches a result of a search of at least a second website [see Col. 1, Line 64 to Col. 2, Line 67 and Col. 7, Lines 10-34]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bates into the teaching of Kawabata for the same reason set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claims 8 and 10 and 11, Kawabata does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, further comprising translating from an original result of the search, wherein the original result has a non-XML format or wherein the result of the search has a non-XML format or wherein the result of the search has an HTML format. However, Bates further teaches the result of the search has a non-XML format [see Col. 1, Lines 45-63]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bates into the teaching of Kawabata for the same reason set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claims 6-7 and 9, Kawabata and Bates do not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, further comprising: translating from an original result of the search, wherein the original result has an XML format, or wherein the original result has a generic XML format, or wherein the result of the search is rendered directly from an XML format. However, XML data format is known and widely used in Web document. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to implement XML format in order to allow designers to create their own customized tags, enabling the definition, transmission, validation and interpretation of data between applications and between organizations.

Regarding claim 12, Kawabata and Bates do not explicitly teach the method of claim 10, wherein the saving comprises: translating the result of the search from the non-XML format into an XML format. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to convert data from one format to another format such as XML format in order to enable the definition, transmission, validation and interpretation of data between applications and between organizations.

Regarding claim 13, Kawabata further teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: in the selected folder, marking the saved portion to identify whether it has been viewed by the user [see Figs. 3 & 10].

Regarding claim 14, Kawabata further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the user is a first user, and the method further comprises: in response to a command from the first user, selectively enabling access to the selected folder via the server information handling system by one or more second users specified by the first user [see Fig. 3].

Claims 15-18, 22, 24-25 and 27-28 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 1-4, 8, 10-11 and 13-14.

Claim 20-21 and 23 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 6-7 and 9.

Claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 12.

Claims 29-32, 36, 38-39 41-42 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 1-4, 8, 10-11 and 13-14.

Claim 34-35 and 37 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 6-7 and 9.

Claim 40 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 12.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 5, 19 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Other References Cited

8. The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A) Brewster et al, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2002/0147847 A1.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT

MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CAR 1.136(A) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT, HOWEVER, WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3991. The Group fax phone number is (571) 273-8300. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on (571) 272-4006.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip B Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455
Jan 20, 2009